| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Applicati n No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | 09/830,011 | SMYTHE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Lori A. Clow, Ph.D. | 1631 | |
| All Participants: | All Participants: Status of Application: | | |
| (1) Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.(PTO). | (3) | | |
| (2) <u>Beth Burrous (Apps Rep)</u> . | (4) | | |
| Date of Interview: 29 January 2004 | Time: | | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | icant's representative) | | |
| Part I. | | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | | |
| • | | | |
| Claims discussed: | | | |
| | | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | | |
| | | | |
| Part II. | | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN A message was left for the attorney, Beth Burrous, stating that | | | |
| Part III. | | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand | The examiner will provide a water erecord of the substance of | written summary of the substance the interview, since the interview | |
| | | | |
| | | • | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| . // | | | |
| (Applica | nt/Applicant's Representative | Signatura if appropriate) | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica | nivapplicant's Representative | s Signature – Il appropriate) | |